

REMARKS

Independent Claims 1, 11, and 19 are revised in a further effort to define novel subject matter over the art of record. Claims 4 and 13 were cancelled in a previous response and Claims 21-26 are here cancelled, all without prejudice. The applicants may file a continuation application directed to the subject matter of the cancelled claims.

The undersigned thanks Examiner Paula for the telephone interview held on January 11, 2006. A proposed revision of Claim 1 was discussed during the interview, but agreement as to allowability of that proposed revision was not reached. The undersigned argued that the present invention pertains to comments appearing at one or more particular locations within an electronic document, whereas the reference *Staroffice* discloses only a dialog box global to an entire document. The undersigned said that he would further revise at least independent Claim 1 for further support of that argument.

Claims 1-3, 5-12, 14-20, and 27 stand rejected as anticipated by *Staroffice*. The applicants respectfully traverse that rejection as possibly applied to the amended claims.

The present invention is concerned with removing personal information from an electronic document produced by a document-generating application. In the disclosed embodiment depicted in Figs. 5 and 6 of this application, the exemplary comment 501 appears at a discrete location within the document 500, namely, pertaining to the word "dog" within that document. One or more pieces of personal information ("Mary Smith" in the example of Fig. 5) are included with each comment appearing within the document. According to Claim 1, activating the privacy option removes that personal information and replaces it with generic information included with each comment appearing in the document. By activating the privacy option according to the method of

Claim 1, personal information included with each comment appearing at one or more discrete locations within the document is removed and replaced with generic information for inclusion with each such comment.

Staroffice is not concerned with a document-generating application that produces comments appearing within a document. The screenshots of that reference illustrate a Properties dialog box for viewing and editing properties of StarWriter documents, namely, *global* properties of the *global* document. For example, screenshot No. 1 of *Staroffice* shows the Properties dialog box apparently opened on top of blank document entitled "test properties doc. sdw". That blank document contains no comment appearing anywhere within the document. The Properties dialog box in *Staroffice* is generated independently of any content or location within that document.

Staroffice does not disclose a document-generating application including a comment appearing at one or more discrete locations within the document. That reference also fails to disclose activating a privacy option to remove personal information included with each comment appearing within a document, and to replace that personal information with generic information included with each comment appearing in the document. The Properties dialog box shown in *Staroffice* is global to the entire document and, as such, is not capable of appearing at a discrete location within the document. Furthermore, *Staroffice* fails to disclose any privacy option that removes personal information from each comment as defined in Claim 1, or that replaces that personal information with generic information included with each comment, also as required by Claim 1.

Accordingly, *Staroffice* fails to anticipate a method including the limitations set forth in Claim 1 and in the claims dependent thereon.

Amended Claim 11 defines the present method to include the elements mentioned above and novel vs. *Staroffice*. The method of Claim 11 deals with an electronic document having a comment visible at a discrete location within the document and containing personal information. When a computer-implemented privacy option is activated, the personal information is removed from the comment and replaced with generic information visible in the comment within the document. As pointed out above, *Staroffice* does not disclose comments visible at discrete locations within an electronic document, and that reference does not disclose any privacy option for removing personal information from those comments and replacing that personal information with generic information visible in the comment within the document. Accordingly, Claim 11 and the claims depending thereon are novel over *Staroffice*.

Claim 19 defines a computer readable medium having computer-executable instructions for performing the recited method. That method includes the above-discussed limitations that are missing from *Staroffice*. Accordingly, amended Claim 19 and the claims depending thereon are novel over *Staroffice*.

The rejection of Claims 21-26 is moot as those claims are cancelled from the present application.

The foregoing is submitted as a complete response to the Office action identified above. The applicants respectfully solicit a notice of allowance to this application.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD



Date: January 18, 2006

Roger T. Frost

Reg. No. 22,176

Merchant & Gould, LLC
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903
Telephone: 404.954.5100

